

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

IN RE: UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
PASSENGER SEXUAL ASSAULT
LITIGATION

Case No. 3:23-md-03084-CRB

**[PROPOSED] ORDER REGARDING
DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS CASES
FOR FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH
AMENDED PTO 10**

This Document Relates to:

P.L. v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al.,
No. 3:24-cv-02847-CRB

C.M. v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al.,
No. 3:24-cv-05182-CRB

*Jane Doe NLG (M.M.) v. Uber
Technologies, Inc., et al.*, No. 3:25-cv-
02653-CRB

*Jane Doe 692195 v. Uber Technologies,
Inc., et al.*, No. 3:25-cv-03421-CRB

*Jane Doe KGDB 016 v. Uber
Technologies, Inc., et al.*, No. 3:25-cv-
04337-CRB

*Jane Doe KGDB 018 v. Uber
Technologies, Inc., et al.*, No. 3:25-cv-
04355-CRB

*Jane Doe 694403 v. Uber Technologies,
Inc., et al.*, No. 3:25-cv-04585-CRB

Watt v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al.,
No. 3:25-cv-04704-CRB

[PROPOSED] ORDER REGARDING MOTION TO
DISMISS CASES FOR FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH AMENDED PTO 10

Case No. 3:23-md-03084-CRB

[PROPOSED] ORDER

Having considered Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss Cases for Failure to Comply with Amended PTO 10 (the “Motion”), the Court finds that the Plaintiffs subject to Defendants’ Motion, identified in Exhibit A hereto, have violated Amended Pretrial Order No. 10 and caused prejudice to Uber.

The Court therefore hereby ORDERS as follows:

1. The claims of the Plaintiffs identified in Exhibit A to this Order are DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE pursuant to Amended PTO No. 10 (ECF No. 4287).
2. Plaintiffs’ counsel shall file notices of dismissal within 14 days of this Order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: _____, 2026

HON. CHARLES R. BREYER
United States District Court Judge

EXHIBIT A

MDL ID	Case Number
1349	3:24-cv-02847
1741	3:24-cv-05182
3157	3:25-cv-02653
3290	3:25-cv-03421
3433	3:25-cv-04337
3435	3:25-cv-04355
3475	3:25-cv-04585
3499	3:25-cv-04704